

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

November 9, 2004

6:30 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Garrity, Smith, Lopez

Messrs.: Lt. Valenti, Captain Mara, F. Thomas, R. Larochelle, R. MacKenzie, Chief Kane, S. Maranto, R. Ludwig

Chairman O'Neil stated with the support of the Committee I would like to jump around here a little bit and get people out of here early so they won't have to sit through the entire meeting. The first item will be Item 10:

Discussion with representatives of the Police Department relative to the towing contract for snow emergencies.

Chairman O'Neil stated the Traffic Committee took this up this evening. The recommendation was handed out. It is to raise the fee from \$85 to \$125 of which \$25 would be retained by the City to cover expenses.

Alderman Garrity asked have expenses gone up that much on the City side and what is the reason for that.

Lt. Valenti answered on the City side we would only get \$5 more and there has been an increase in the cost of the police detail. Actually we had a hand out earlier. Last year we were in the red for...there were three snow emergencies last December and that is all we had for the year. We were actually in the red for \$1,853.58.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we are going from \$85 of which the City receives \$20 and the towing companies get \$65 up to \$125 of which the City will retain \$25 of that.

Lt. Valenti answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated as the Lieutenant explained at the Traffic Committee there are now expenses of operating two lots that the towing companies are responsible for.

Alderman Lopez stated \$125...right now it is \$85 and you get \$20. That is \$105 right.

Lt. Valenti responded no. \$85 right now currently for snow emergency tow. \$20 goes to the City and \$65 to the contractor.

Alderman Lopez asked so the City gets \$20 of the \$85.

Lt. Valenti answered correct.

Alderman Lopez asked and you are going to raise it from \$85 to \$125.

Lt. Valenti answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked now explain that difference between the \$65 and the \$125.

Lt. Valenti answered the contractor would receive \$100 and the City would receive \$25. As we previously said there has been an increase in the cost of the police detail. There is also an estimated projection that the cost would go up almost \$800 for each snow emergency due to the increase in the amount of lots. We are going to have two sheds now, which is going to increase the police detail one officer per detail for 24 hours. That cost would be \$940.

Alderman Lopez replied so you want \$5 more and that is \$25. That is a separate issue. What an individual now, the guy that is towing it, is going to go from \$85 to \$90 because you need that \$5 but are you telling me now that that guy is going to get \$100 to tow a vehicle?

Lt. Valenti responded yes.

Alderman Lopez asked and you have had towing companies give you bids on that.

Lt. Valenti answered we are working with the two companies on a contract and as a result of the City going from one shed or one facility for towing operations we now have to lots.

Alderman Lopez replied I understand that. I understand the \$5 and I don't have any problem with the \$5.

Chairman O'Neil stated the \$5 doesn't come out of the City side. That comes from the towing companies.

Alderman Lopez responded right. They get \$20. It is \$85 now and you get \$20. Your increase because of the two lots is \$5.

Lt. Valenti stated yes.

Alderman Lopez stated so that brings it to \$90 but just follow me. You are telling me that the towing companies are telling you that they are going to increase their towing fee to what?

Lt. Valenti answered to \$100.

Alderman Lopez stated so that is a \$35 increase for towing a vehicle in the City.

Lt. Valenti replied yes.

Alderman Lopez asked and nobody will tow for less than that.

Captain David Mara stated we have had two meetings with the tow companies that are currently on our contract. The contract we have now expires on December 14. That contract that we have now has the current cost of \$20 and a \$65 for a total of \$85. That now goes to one tow lot. What the tow contractors...they gave us a written proposal that we are not bringing forward today. They asked for \$125 plus another \$20 fee for \$145. That is what they proposed and we felt that was unreasonable. I called around to see what towing costs are in different municipalities and also the added cost of manning...what they need to do, before they had the cost of getting a shed, heating that shed and manning that shed with a person and also having a tow lot attendant. Now those costs are going to be doubled because we have two lots. We have the one at the West Side Arena and we have the one at Derryfield Park. There is also the point they made about the added cost of fuel. We felt based on looking into this and based on what their demands were and other factors that \$100 wasn't unreasonable. From the Police Department's point of view as far as the City's extra cost I know you said you didn't have a problem with that but from our point of view the increase for the fee to get to \$25 we felt that it would be more prudent to have people that are actually violating the ordinance pay for that as opposed to the people that are abiding by the law. That is how we came up with this amount.

Alderman Lopez stated it seems to me that it is a really high cost to tow a vehicle when the insurance companies are only authorized to pay \$50 or \$60. Did you check with the insurance companies as to what they are going to reimburse if

people have their vehicles towed? I understand the police aspect of it for somebody parking there but you know as well as I do that every year we have this problem and in a lot of cases the whole City doesn't get towed at one time. Some people get towed and some people don't and we always have that problem. I think \$125 again is excessive. Are you sure we are not being gouged by these towing companies?

Captain Mara replied we believe from our negotiations in meeting with them...like I said their proposal would have been \$145. We felt that was too high and we felt that based on their point about the extra and I don't want to keep reiterating this but their costs now are going to be doubled from what they were.

Chairman O'Neil asked Lt. Valenti didn't you mentioned earlier at the Traffic Committee meeting that ours was actually higher at one time and we lowered it.

Lt. Valenti answered yes. The history back in the 80's is the actual cost was \$90 with \$35 going to the City and \$55 going to the contractor. We reduced that to \$85 with \$20 going to the City and \$65 to the contractor and we haven't seen an increase since the early 90's. We did check around. The City of Portsmouth actually for a nighttime tow charges \$100 to the consumer.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it is important. People say \$125 for a tow and that is pretty steep in our society and the way the economy is today. When you say that you checked...that you have a contract with the towing companies, is that one towing company? How many towing companies and did you go out to other towing companies in the City or is that all of the towing in the City?

Lt. Valenti responded right now we have nine towing companies on the current contract list but prior to some issues with some of the contractor's lots we actually had 13 contractors on the current contract. Of that 13, only 9 were able to get their license.

Captain Mara stated I would like to point out that after December 14 we will open it up and there might be some different towing companies on that list.

Alderman Lopez stated I have one last question and then I will keep quiet. So your philosophy is that if we told the towing companies it would be \$90 none of them would tow any cars?

Captain Mara responded their demands to us during the meeting...I asked them several times so you are telling me if we do not approve the amount you are asking that none of you want to sign the contract and they said yes that is true. We still

felt that was not a reasonable price. Tomorrow we will have a meeting with them and say this is what we have before the Aldermen.

Lt. Valenti stated Alderman Lopez if I could just point out they have seen a dramatic increase in the cost of fuel and labor. They are telling us that their insurance costs have gone up dramatically and the cost of the vehicle itself. I have noticed during snow emergency operations that the operators not only have to tow the vehicle but quite often they have to get out of the vehicle and dig these vehicles out. It is actually very labor intensive to tow a vehicle during a snow emergency operation.

Alderman Shea stated I think partially the question that I have was answered but I would like to approach it from this point of view. Let's assume for the sake of discussion that your department didn't get any money at all. You didn't get \$20 and you didn't get \$25. What impact does that have on your budgetary concerns? Do you use this money as part of your budget? Is that why you used \$20 initially?

Lt. Valenti responded the money that we collect from the tow itself goes into the general fund and then the City pays the officers for the detail.

Alderman Shea asked the money goes into the general fund and then the money is used to pay the officers.

Lt. Valenti answered the City pays the officers for the detail.

Chairman O'Neil asked could you maybe explain Lt. Valenti that just based on the report you gave out from three storms last year there are generally seven officers involved. There are six officers and a supervisor. Could you just explain how that works during a snow operation?

Lt. Valenti answered there are five officers. We designate two on the West Side and three on the East Side. A supervisor will go with a City official, as well as an officer who goes with somebody from the Highway Department and they have a designated area. They go to areas like one-way streets and main thoroughfares to try to clear them out first and tow the vehicles. Certainly they get directed to the areas they need to tow from.

Chairman O'Neil stated a ticket actually has to be put on a vehicle to tow it correct.

Lt. Valenti answered no. What the officer does is he will go to a certain street and if he sees a vehicle that needs to be towed he will call that into the shed. They will

send a wrecker over and the officer records that and then he calls the shed and the officer inside the shed also records it and it is kept at the Police Department.

Alderman Lopez asked are these all overtime officers or are they officers on duty.

Lt. Valenti answered they are on detail.

Alderman Lopez asked could you explain that. They are on duty and they are detailed to do this?

Lt. Valenti answered yes.

Captain Mara stated actually they are not working their regular shift. They are hired at a set rate by the City.

Alderman Lopez asked the detail rate is what \$35 or \$38.

Lt. Valenti answered \$38.33.

Alderman Lopez asked and you are only going to get \$25.

Lt. Valenti answered \$25 per vehicle.

Alderman Garrity moved to approve the increase for snow emergency towing to \$125 with the City getting \$25 and the towing contractor getting \$100. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Lopez being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Request for CIP Budget Authorization extensions from June 30, 2004 to December 31, 2004 as follows:

214704	Lead Safe For Kid's Sake – Revision #1
410704	Streetsweeper – Revision #3

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the CIP budget authorization extensions.

Chairman O'Neil addressed a new item of business regarding a request from the Police Department to accept a vehicle from the Manchester Police Athletic League and assign it to the Manchester Police Department's fleet.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to accept the vehicle.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will now move to the Highway Department's presentation regarding Granite Street.

Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, stated with me here tonight are members of the CLD Consulting Firm. To my right is Chris Bean and to my far right is Roc Larochelle. The reason we are here tonight is to give you a status report on the Granite Street project. If you remember back at the end of September I gave the Board a notification that we had received one bid for the Granite Street project that had greatly exceeded the engineer's estimates so we later rejected that bid. We didn't get a lot of interest in the project and we actually had planned on advertising the project earlier in the summer, actually in July for bids in August. At a pre-bid meeting we saw that we weren't receiving too much interest in the project so we cancelled that bid and rebid it to come in in September and unfortunately we only had one bid. After rejecting that bid we had the firm of CLD talk to all of the contractors that showed some interest in the project to see what some of their concerns were and to try to get a handle on why they didn't bid the project. As a result of the contacts with the contractors we found out there were certain issues that they raised to us. One of the major issues is that the project overall is...50% of the cost of the project is bridge retain wall work and the other 50% of the project was roadwork. In addition, that entire project was spread out over a three year period of time so typically we found that a road contractor really didn't want to tie up his bonding capacity over a three year period when 50% of the project was probably going to be subbed out to a bridge contractor and vice versa. We also found out that the state put a limitation on us as far as when we could work in the river because of fish, snails and mussels. We could only work in the river over the winter months for a short window of time, a five month period, and that was a very aggressive period of time for a contractor to get out there and do the work so there were some concerns from some of the contractors relating to that short window. In addition, the road work on the West Side because this work is being done at the same time that the state work at the Exit 5 interchange at the Everett Turnpike is going to be done we really couldn't be doing a lot of work over on the West Side on the roadway until the state put down the bridge at the Everett Turnpike over Granite Street. So there was actually a period where our project was almost going to be put on hold until the state caught up with us. Also, we found out that that area is obviously very congested over there and as a result of the congestion there was a lot of phasing of the work that bothered contractors and made them somewhat reluctant to bid. We also had concerns raised because if you know the Granite Street area it is a very, very tight area. There is not a heck of a lot of room for a contractor to utilize a staging area, especially the bridge contractor who needs to have good access out to the river and

is going to have large pieces of equipment, etc. Lastly, we found in trying to make the project very decorative, the bridge...we proposed to put what is called a decorative skirt on the lower part of the Granite Street bridge to cover up the exposed beams. Some contracts don't like to get into the specialty work. So after we found out these concerns we kind of regrouped to decide how we should move forward with the project. Before I give you an idea of where we are heading I also want to note that we got one bid...the state just had bids due in recently for what is called the B contract, which is the relocation of Allard Drive and the relocation of our interceptor sewer, which is a prelude to the major Everett Turnpike work. They received no bids. So even though we got a high bid, we at least got a bid. Moving forward after hearing what the contractors had to say we sat down with our contractors and the state and we developed a project approach that we feel will get more interest by the contractors and hopefully better prices. What we are going to do is break the City project into three. The West Side will be incorporated under the state B project. As I mentioned, a lot of the work on the West Side couldn't be done until the state had a lot of their work done so it makes sense to incorporate that portion of work under the state project. There will be less contractor interference and hopefully we will get a good price for that work where it is going to be tied into a major state project. We are breaking out and going to advertise a second phase or a second contract more or less, which will be for the bridge and retaining wall work. That as I mentioned is about 50% of the total construction project. Now we hope to entice bridge contractors to come in and focus on that project. They don't need to worry about doing a lot of the roadwork. They will be doing the work they specialize in. The state's C project is going out this coming spring. We hope to advertise the bridge project shortly afterwards and quite frankly we hope to entice the state contractors to maybe bid on our bridge project and again giving us a good price. The third project that we are looking at is a year after we put out the bridge project and the West Side with the state we are looking at doing the roadway on the East Side of the City, again focusing in on road work and hoping to entice roadway contractors who specialize in that area. We also have done some if you want to call it value engineering on the project. As I mentioned this bridge skirt gave a lot of contractor's heartburn and quite frankly raised the price of the contract and knocked that out of the proposed design or the project moving forward and there are other cost savings that Roc will go into in a little more detail. In the interim, between now and spring we are actively looking at obtaining an additional staging area in the Granite Street area so that we can give the contractor working for us more room to spread out his equipment and address the concern that we heard from them. Lastly, what we are going to do is we are meeting tomorrow – the City, myself, the state and the consultants with the associated general contractors up at the state DOT in order to generate interest on the part of contractors for our project and also on the part of the state to generate interest on their project. So this plan moving forward we feel that we are going to realize some savings in order to meet budgetary requirements or at least come

closer to budgetary requirements and in addition we have a fallback plan in case these items don't work. The budget that Roc will be reviewing with you tonight there is one thing that we couldn't account for. As I mentioned by breaking out the contract that is going to entice the contractors and there is going to be a value placed on that but it is hard to quantify what that value is going to be. Providing additional staging for the contractor again is a value but it is hard to quantify that so the numbers, the budgets that we are going to review with you tonight don't take that into account. Having said that what I would like to do is turn it over to Chris and Roc.

Roc Larochelle stated there are a lot of complex issues. We made a lot of phone calls to a lot of contractors to try to define these issues that Frank was talking about and to try to see how we could resolve these things. You know he talked about a lot of complexities. The two basic themes that come out of this, out of dealing with all of the contractors and defining all of this are two basic themes. One is overall unit cost for the project and the other one, the major theme, is project complexity. So what we have tried to do is work out a lot of what Frank talked about with project phasing. I will kind of walk you through on this map over here. We worked a lot to try to eliminate a lot of the complexity in the contractors to alleviate some of the contractor concerns and make it more enticing for them to come to the table and actually bid on the project. That is what a lot of this is about. He talked already about some of the issues that came up. There are permit restrictions for work in the river so we have dealt with that. I will take you through some of the things we have done there and some of the scheduling concerns in dealing with the coordination of the contracts. This is a very complex project. It is a very complex series of projects. It is a lot of work tied up in a huge commitment for both the City and the State to get all of this done. It is a very important project and we are committed to working through this. So what have we done about the costs? Some of the things that Frank indicated – we have looked at some of the overall project scope and looked at things like reducing or eliminating some of the scope items, some of the ornamental features and dropped some of the costs out of that. Those are some of the things that we have done. We have also looked at cutting the project up into several different contracts so that the contracts are more manageable. What I am going to show you here now on this site on this map is how the contracts are intended to be broken up. What is in blue over here, there is relocated Allard Drive and some work down here on the southern side of the interchange and the Turner Street area, some building demolitions and soundwall construction. That would all be advertised under what the state has termed their B contract. This is the one that advertised recently in October and they received no bids for that. They are looking to put that back out on the street in November. They will be readvertising that project. The next contract to go would be what is in purple here. This is the major interstate project, which rebuilds the whole interchange here, the bridge over the turnpike as well as

about a mile of I-293. One of the major concerns we heard from the contractors when we spoke with them was the issue of coordination with the contracts. We were looking for the City's contractor to work on this side of the river, as well as complete portions of the project on the western side of the river over here. If you look at the map, it is pretty obvious that there would be some concerns about working in this area with the state contractor and the city contractor and coordination of all of that activity so one of the things that we talked to the state about was the potential of putting this portion of the contract within the state's contract and advertising that as part of what they call their C contract, which would advertise next spring. The state has agreed with that and that has been taken to the front office and that is how it is going to move forward. It will be advertised as part of that so this whole portion of the City's contract will be put into the state contract and what that does is it takes a lot of the complexity out of the contract in dealing with the traffic control issues around the whole interchange and having contractors cross across the river between work areas. The next step as Frank indicated would be to advertise an individual bridge contract. One of the things that we identified in the contractor calls was difficult specialty work. Bridge contractors versus roadway contractors. Because the work was so evenly split, it was very difficult for a lot of the bridge contractors like a Chinbro or even a Reed & Reed, who were some of the people that were looking at the contracts, to get roadway contractors interested in doing this work because it was really...when you look at the bridge and how the roadway is split up it is very difficult to actually manage that work and keep a cash flow from a contractor's perspective so one of the things that we looked at was breaking out this here as an individual bridge contract so that would be our contract 14025, which is shown in yellow on your map, I believe and the intention here is to advertise this project directly after the state advertises their project here in purple next year. What that leaves is that the following year we would look to advertise this project here, which is shown in green, which is the D contract, which would be all of the roadways and railroad crossing work here in the B&M Railroad all the way up to Elm Street as well. That is how we dealt with some of the complications in the contract. A couple of other things that came up in the contractor calls that we made...you know all of this is to try to make it easier for them and take away the complications and the questions so that we can hopefully get some better bids and a more level bidding field and get some better interest in this to drive costs down. Frank indicated that there were some very severe restrictions for work in the river here. The restrictions that were put on the contractor were from November until April. The contractor would be required to work in the dead of winter with high river flows. What we did is we worked with DES and got approval from them...actually that was from Fish & Game, we got an approval to extend that work window until September adding a couple of more months to their timeframe. That was a major element of what some of the contractors had shied away from the contract for was that time restriction and the complications associated with that. Another element

of the river work was temporary impacts. We had done a lot of coordination with DES to get our permits in place based on an assumption of how much temporary impact there was going to be in the river. What we heard from talking to the contractors was that they needed more room. They have bigger machines now than they did when they built the original bridge so it is necessary to have a larger work platform in the river so the associated impacts get bigger. What we did was we coordinated with DES on that and they have also granted us that approval through an amended permit application to allow us additional impacts. Hopefully that will go a long way in appeasing some of the contractors in dealing with the work area concerns and ultimately relate back to project cost. We have talked about the contract consolidation. Now we will have three separate contracts. One with the state. What that also does is allow smaller contractors to come to the table and actually express interest in the project. Whereby the original contract was in the range of about \$16 million, obviously there are smaller contractors that may not necessarily be able to bid on a project like that because it may exceed their bonding capacity. One of the things that Frank also touched on was the time period for the contract. The bridge contract is expected to take about three years to build. One of the issues that we heard loud and clear from the contractors, the roadway contractors, is that to build this portion and this portion is not going to take three years so if their schedule is dictated by a three year project duration on the bridge then they are also tying up their bonds for that period of time. One of the other things that we worked on to deal with the project complexities is this meeting that Frank indicated that is going to happen with AGC, Associated General Contractors. That will go a long way in addressing some of the concerns that the contractors have expressed and identifying some of the areas that the state and the City have worked on to deal with some of the issues, such as contaminated soils and difficult construction phases between the two projects. I think it has been unclear at this point to some of the contractors how much coordination there has been between the City and the state. What we are hoping to do is present that scenario to the contractors and show them that it is a unified approach here between the City and the state for a project that is very important to the whole region, as well as the City of Manchester. The results in everything that we did in looking at some of the cost savings alternatives that Frank kind of outlined, we cut about \$1.5 million overall project cost. We have worked to reduce the overall contractor risk by eliminating some of the complexities as I discussed and now we have a plan to readvertise the project in three different segments and hopefully that will address a lot of those contractor concerns. Even so, with all of that stuff happening, the plan is still to have all of the work completed by the end of 2008. Now I will cover some of the cost elements. There is a handout that you received and I will try to run through this as fast as I can. The three separate contracts that were broken out, if you look at the top of the sheet it says contract 10622C West Side with an advertising date of June 2005. Below that there is contract 14025, which is the bridge that would advertise basically a month after that in July 2005.

Following that there would be the East Side and the railroad contract, which would advertise in 2006. The general costs after we compared the bid that we got from Reed and Reed and took a better look at what average costs are in today's market is one of the things that is clearly affecting a lot of the projects that the City and the state are putting out are higher asphalt, oil and steel prices and that has had a significant impact on the overall cost of the project – upwards of 10% to 15% to 20% in some cases. The overall contract totals as they are now estimated as you can see they are \$19.398 million, which includes all of the construction engineering and the construction costs. Other project costs – \$3.5 million, which includes the design engineering and the right-of-way costs. Right-of-way has all been purchased to date. The next item, Item 3 would be a summary of cost alternatives and this will explain a lot of the items that we looked at for cost savings alternatives. We eliminated a set of concrete stairs. You can walk through all of these items. There were a number of items that had significant price tags to them. The bridge skirts that Frank identified were \$333,000 approximately. There were a number of other alternatives that essentially dropped out about \$1.5 million of that cost to bring it down to a total project cost of about \$21.5 million. The next item is fairly important and I think you need to see this. It identifies all of the funding levels, the state and federal reimbursement levels. This is what identifies what came in from Washington. The funding that we chased so hard and the funding that Judd Gregg worked very, very hard to get us as well as some of the other funds that are being filtered through the state DOT. The \$14.9 million is essentially what came from Washington through Senator Judd Gregg's efforts. Underneath that \$725,000 is part of a railroad at grade crossing program that we successfully received funding for through the state transportation bill. That is part of a larger program to improve all of the crossings downtown for about \$2.1 million. The next part...there are a couple of new overhead sign structures that are being incorporated into the overall design on Granite Street and the state will be reimbursing the City for that out of their turnpike funds. The next part of it are ITS components that were added into the project for a total of \$30,000 so the total revenue coming back or the total reimbursement levels coming back to the City would be about \$15.9 million. So looking at the reimbursement levels versus the total estimated costs to date, the City's share for the project costs falls short by an estimated \$2 million.

Mr. Thomas stated as Roc noted potentially there is a \$2 million shortfall at the end of the project, however, as I mentioned hopefully some of that number will get reduced by breaking up the project into phases and whatnot. That additional money would not be needed until FY06. If by chance funds are not going to be available in FY06 we have identified approximately \$2.5 million of savings if we cut back the scope of the work so that the work ends at Canal Street temporarily. So we can go ahead with the project in the three phases. We will put out two bids. Once the two bids are out we will have a good handle on whether we save money,

whether the costs are still running high. That will give us time to make a determination on the third phase of the project and if by chance there aren't funds available in FY06 to cover any shortfalls at that time then we would be recommending to shorten up the project to end at Canal Street until funds are available to finish the work up to Elm Street. The work that is involved in the section from Canal Street to Elm Street is basically cosmetic work. It is to dress up the area and to reconstruct the roads. It is not to provide any additional capacity lanes, etc. so the project will work without that. The proposal that we are making is we are suggesting that we proceed with the project in three phases. Two of the phases will be going out in the spring of next year. By next summer we will have a pretty good handle on what we are looking at for costs, which will further define our needs or potential shortfalls in the third phase but we do have a fall back position if funds do not become available if there is a shortage for the third phase. Lastly, before we turn it over to questions it has been mentioned a few times here how we have been working...the City's project is very interconnected with the state project. We have been working hand in hand with the state. We have been getting tremendous cooperation. Again, as mentioned both the state and us are going to be up talking to the Associated General Contractors tomorrow. Out in the audience we have Bob Landry from NH DOT. He has been very beneficial to us and has given us guidance in coordinating these two projects. Having said that, I guess we will open it up to whatever questions you have.

Alderman Shea stated the explanation is really clear and excellent. So often I have asked for explanations and it is murky but you have explained it very well and I appreciate that Roc. The only question I have, Frank, is when we coordinate or try to incorporate with the state do we pay the state to hire a contractor to do the work that we as a City do or how does that process work?

Mr. Thomas answered the state has...everything you see in purple the state will be doing. The state's project alone without the work on Granite Street is somewhere like \$22 or \$25 million or somewhere in that range. They will be incorporating our work into that and when they bid it out it will be one contract and all of the work will be done on a unit price basis so we will be able to calculate or the state will be able to calculate for us exactly what the cost of our work was based on these unit prices. Instead of hiring a consultant like CLD, we pay the state somewhere between a 5% and 6% administrative fee, which is reasonable.

Alderman Lopez asked how does this compare with the numbers that were presented when this whole project started. Are we going to be \$2 million in the hole? Is that what we are saying?

Mr. Thomas answered right now it looks like we are going to be \$2 million in the hole based on the amount of money that we have allocated. At the public hearing,

this project was identified as between a \$19 to \$21 million project. Prices have gone up over the last year. Just in the period of time between December of 2003 when we were preparing our CIP to July when we first advertised the project, the project went up in price because of issues that were mentioned here tonight – steel prices, fuel prices and whatnot by \$1.7 million. That basically makes up the difference. We are short in what is allocated in the CIP but it is due to numerous reasons.

Alderman Lopez asked what about the high cost. I know we were talking about \$18 or \$21 million when this project first started. Is somebody still going to be working on trying to get additional funds or is that the end of the funds that we are going to get?

Mr. Thomas answered we have gotten \$15 million from the federal government through earmarks minus about \$52,000 in administrative fees working through the system. I doubt if we will be able to get any more. We can obviously ask Senator Gregg for more assistance but quite frankly I think the City has been very fortunate in being able to obtain this \$15 million. Keep in mind that this interchange 5 or Exit 5 project has been scheduled with the state for a full interchange and it is not the state's responsibility to make the local roads work with the new interchange. So without us doing this needed Granite Street widening project – forget about the fact that it is going to be the gateway to the City, which I think is very, very important. This is a project that had to be done. We had to do this project and I think we were very, very fortunate in getting federal money. As Roc noted there were other monies we were able to tap into - railroad crossing funds, which added sizably to it. We will continue to look but I don't want to say that there is a pot of gold at a rainbow out there. We will continue to investigate and we can talk to Senator Gregg but I think we are going to have to keep our wits about us and that is why we have spent a lot of time talking to contractors figuring out what is the best way to do it. I hope that when everything is said and done that we are not going to be \$2 million in the hole but that we are going to see some savings. We are not going to move forward without giving the CIP Committee and the Board a true picture of where we stand here today. Fuel costs are going down. I have been monitoring them on a weekly basis and they are starting to go down a little bit. Are they going to go down a lot? I don't know. Steel prices I don't see going down. China is just buying up all of the steel in the world. However, I personally feel that giving the contractor more time to work out in the river and a larger work platform and I think a big key here and you will be hearing more down the road but if we can cut some deals to get the contractor more of a staging area down in that Granite/Commercial Street area to do this work I think we are going to see again some more savings. So I am optimistic that we are going to come in lower than that \$2 million shortfall but we

have to be honest up front. I think this is a great plan that we have put together and as I said this is something that we have hammered out with the state and CLD.

Alderman Lopez stated I think everyone has worked together and done a great job. I just have one last question. The purple area that you said you are going to build out or contract out to one contractor, would you have the option if that contract comes in high where you could not do the bridge or would you select to do the bridge and not do the west side? If you understand my question.

Mr. Thomas responded yes definitely. Quite frankly I don't think that is going to happen because typically when you put a small piece of the puzzle with a big, big project instead of getting higher prices you are going to typically get lower prices. Now before we give the state the go ahead we are going to want to take a look at those unit prices so that we make sure that for whatever reason the contractor didn't dump a lot of his other costs into the City portion. We could then delete that out of the state portion and potentially readvertise the City roadwork on the West Side at a later date. Again, I don't see that happening.

Alderman Smith asked Frank in regards to the bridge will that be open at all times. The reason I am asking is we have the baseball field down there and they have to utilize Exit 4, which is the Queen City bridge, which is a nightmare right now.

Mr. Thomas answered the plan is to keep traffic moving at all times up and down Granite Street. There are going to be restrictions. Are there going to be four lanes at all times? No. Will there be a short period of time when the area is closed? Obviously there will be when the state starts taking the steel down from the bridge at the Everett Turnpike over Granite Street. Traffic flow and pedestrian movement, quite frankly, is a horror show down there and it is not going to get any better by this contract and the work that is going to be done down in that area. You have to know that up front. However, we have built in to make sure that we do maintain pedestrian access and traffic movement at all time and of course we are going to try to maximize traffic movement as much as we can.

Alderman Smith stated just to follow-up, Frank, you know we have had construction over in my area for three and a half years and it is going to continue, I guess, for three more years. As you know I am very concerned about the Queen City bridge because there is no right hand turn to go over to the Verizon Center or to the ball field. It is stacked up on the ramp way at 293 when you come off of Exit 4 right by Applebees. It is a nightmare over there. The traffic is backed up all the way. It is like a second cousin to South Willow Street.

Mr. Thomas responded South Willow Street is progress and when you see that type of traffic in a commercial area, that is good. I understand totally what you are

saying. Obviously we are going to have to do work with signage. We are going to have to...the good point I guess is we do have access at Queen City Avenue and we have access at Amoskeag. I think we have to make it known that this area is going to be under construction and quite frankly once you come through there once you are going to seek alternate routes.

Alderman Garrity stated Frank this has been billed the gateway to the City and I have a couple of questions on the cosmetics of the bridge. I mean we are going to have the Hands Across the River bridge just south of there that is going to have all of these cosmetic things on it. Is the new bridge going to basically look like the one that is there now?

Mr. Thomas responded yes except the railings are going to be different.

Mr. Larochelle stated I will answer that. When you saw the presentation at the public hearing back in 2003, the presentation that was given showed a concrete bridge rail, an ornamental type rail. That is still the intent here. The intent is to have that ornamental concrete bridge rail on the bridge so it is not going to look exactly like it is. You are not going to have the typical DOT guardrail bridge. The intent is to have the concrete rail with ornamental lighting up and down the street, including on the bridge. What is being taken out of the contract is something called a bridge skirt, which if you are driving down 293 northbound you look at the bridge and all you see are rusted colored gurters. Skirts were intended to...it was an architectural element and serves no other purpose than to cover up some of that basically to dress up the bridge. There were other concerns, I think, that went into looking at dropping that out of the contract. Originally the state DOT had expressed some concern regarding how that was going to affect maintenance of the bridge. So that goes into some of the reasoning in wanting to drop that out. Essentially it is not an element that can be seen when you are standing on the bridge itself so the architectural elements that were proposed as part of the project that were presented at the public hearing remained largely intact with the exception of that bridge skirt on the lower end of the bridge. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Thomas stated I think what you are referring to...we are not just pulling everything out of this project to make it a typical roadway or bridge that you see. The only thing we have taken out of it is that skirt. We have taken out a little brickwork but the sidewalks are still going to be all concrete sidewalks. On the bridge you are going to see these nice black lighting fixtures. The landscaping hasn't been touched. So this is still going to be the gateway into the City. There are going to be bike lanes. The basic proposal that we brought to the Board at the public hearings and whatnot haven't changed. Just this lower skirt that quite frankly from a distance coming down the off ramp or on the turnpike would look a

little nicer than seeing the steel but once you travel across the bridge you wouldn't even know that it was there.

Alderman Lopez stated I want to capitalize on Alderman Smith's line of questioning. Did the DOT...when you are doing the final analysis and the contracts and all of that is there some provision that our livelihood is on the Verizon and the new baseball stadium down there. Is there a way that could be worked out with the City where the contractors work at night or whatever when we have activities in the City or how is this going to work where we are going to be strapped to have everybody go across the Queen City bridge or the Amoskeag bridge? Has anybody looked into that as far as crippling the City of Manchester?

Mr. Thomas responded let me start off and if I can't answer it for you we will let Mr. Landry do it. Obviously these are all considerations that are taken. I know the state has taken these into consideration also. With any major construction project there is going to be some disruption but we are going to try to maintain as much access as possible for as long as possible. That has always been a high priority with the state. It has always been a high priority in our projects and again it is a cost issue. That has added costs to our project and I am sure it has added costs to the state project. I think the only comparison I can make is that on maybe a smaller scale the work that was down at the Brown Avenue interchange. That was quite a major project. That bridge was completely taken down and widened and whatnot. I go through there everyday, twice a day and quite frankly it wasn't that difficult. If you can remember the project that was done up at South Willow Street at the Mall of NH at 93. Again, these are issues that we are all aware of. They are issues that are going to be addressed to the best of our capability but nobody wants to snow anybody. When you have this type of construction there are going to be some delays and some heartaches.

Alderman DeVries stated I think I caught you briefly addressing the right-of-way when Roc was going through and saying that it was already...I see it says it is already programmed. Does that mean we have already locked up the pricing on establishing our right-of-way?

Mr. Thomas responded we have already acquired all of the right-of-way.

Alderman DeVries stated the additional question I had is when we were talking about the deduct, Item E and F and I don't need to get into more bridge technology than probably I care to know but deducting that particular bridge membrane in the pre-cast stack does that affect our longevity, our life of the bridge and is it going to come back and cost us more in the long run.

Mr. Larochelle responded no actually these were items that were identified in discussions with DOT and the contractors. Some of the contractors we spoke to identified some things that would make construction easier for them and quicker. The time between when we actually advertised the project and started analyzing the results of the bids some DOT policies had actually changed, which allowed us to provide the contractor with some flexibility. These are some of the items...a lot of the stuff you don't see when the project is done but these are a lot of the things that we tried to work into the contract that make the complexities of the contract go down for the contractor to bring the overall cost down.

Alderman DeVries stated one final question if I might. The first deduct, the corner stairs, I can't remember that from prior plans.

Mr. Thomas replied there were two sets of stairs being proposed into the parking lot at Jillians. One at the corner there where the light is at Commercial and one down closer to the riverwalk. When we looked at the cost of \$110,000 for a set of stairs at that upper location, quite frankly we just couldn't justify it. We felt that it would serve...that the set of stairs down into the low plaza would provide access into that area and provide access to the future riverwalk in that area and accomplish the same thing. I think it was overkill and for \$110,000 we couldn't justify it. In addition, there are some possible changes that could be happening in that parking lot area down the road and that was another reason we decided to eliminate that one.

Alderman Roy stated I have some quick questions. On the plan as part of the state project there is a sound wall on the western side of 293. I know that is an area that Bob MacKenzie has been working on for redevelopment. Has that been discussed with the property owners and potential landlords?

Mr. Larochelle asked as far as what. As far as putting it up? As far as I know the DOT has negotiated much of the right-of-way down there. I believe all of that is in place and ready to go. They advertised the project and they have secured all of the right-of-way requirements.

Alderman Roy stated one of the beautiful things about this change is that it will spawn some redevelopment and we don't want to shoot ourselves in the foot too early. The second is more of a question than a comment. The aesthetics that are deducted in the summary of cost alternatives, once those are out of the contract are they all done from Day 1, specifically we are giving up the skirts but the concrete versus brick sidewalks. We have been slowly replacing brick sidewalks throughout the downtown area. Is that done from Day 1 or can that be added back in if the savings are there?

Mr. Larochelle asked do you mean can the skirts be added back in or the brick...

Alderman Roy interjected the brick sidewalks.

Mr. Thomas stated on the West Side it will be difficult because that project is moving ahead in the spring as part of the state project and right now it is being called for concrete. Now you can always come back at a later date and cut portions out or replace certain panels of concrete with brick but obviously it wouldn't be cost effective. On the East Side where we have that year lag between putting out the state project there is the ability to make changes if the funding is a little better than anticipated or if we find a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. We never anticipated having 100% brick on this project. It has always been a blend of concrete and brick maybe more along the line of Hanover Street than straight Elm Street.

Alderman Roy stated this is the gateway to the City and the quickest and easiest place to cut is always the aesthetics versus the safety or the longevity of the project. I, for one, want to see this as a proud monument to the gateway to the City for many, many years to come so if we can protect as much of the aesthetics as possible it would be appreciated by this Alderman.

Mr. Thomas responded I think we all feel that same way, Alderman.

Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director stated I would just like to have one clarification. Mr. Thomas did mention that if money is needed it might be needed in FY06. I believe he meant FY07. There is no bonding capacity really in FY06.

Mr. Thomas responded correct. I meant FY07.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have heard the presentation tonight on how the Highway Department intends on proceeding to accomplish this very important construction project for the City. I would ask the Committee to concur with the approach that has been outlined and direct the Highway Department to proceed. I further suggest that the department keep us up-to-date as things move along. He is not asking for any additional funding.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to allow the Highway Department to proceed with the Granite Street Project as outlined.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing the acceptance and

expenditure of funds in the amount of Sixty Seven Thousand Four Hundred Sixty Seven Dollars and Fifty Cents (\$67,467.50/State) for the FY2005 CIP 411505 Emergency Management Preparedness Grants Project.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the resolution and budget authorization.
Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated Chief you have asked for some additional things tonight. I think one of them is tied to this particular item. Is that correct?

Joseph Kane, Fire Chief, stated I have District Chief Goonan here with me tonight who is working on the Office of Emergency Management for the City of Manchester. I also have a letter in. One of the components of this grant is a communications vehicle that we would like to get a registration for and also coming up within the next couple of months we do have another vehicle that is going to be given to us by the state. Both of these vehicles will not cost us any money. The second vehicle is the state gave us a trailer about a year ago and we never had a vehicle to tow the trailer. The City is giving us the money to buy a vehicle to tow the trailer so we would also need a registration for that vehicle.

Chairman O'Neil asked so as part of this motion can we amend it to include the registration for the two vehicles.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization and to provide vehicle registrations for the two vehicles.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing transfer of funds in the amount of Eight Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty Dollars (\$8,320/Cash) for the 2005 CIP 511005 Annual Park Maintenance Program.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the resolution and budget authorizations.
Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make sure...in looking at this it says \$83,320 on Item 4 in the CIP budget authorization. Is that a mistake? It is only \$8,320 correct?

Samuel Maranto, CIP, stated the request is for \$8,200. Those two accounts have a total of \$8,320. I thought it would be appropriate to leave \$120 in the account.

Chairman O'Neil stated if you go to the attachment the second page of Item 4 it says \$83,320. Is that just a misprint? It is supposed to be \$8,320.

Alderman Lopez stated I thought I found some money. I just want to make sure we are on the right number here.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there was a project balance in there before so we are adding \$8,300 to a previous project total and I believe that is the correct number - \$83,320. It is one of those coincidences.

Chairman O'Neil asked so that number is correct and the number of \$8,320 is correct.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked \$83,320 is the correct number.

Mr. Maranto stated initially that account had \$75,000 and if you add the \$8,320 to it.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve the resolution and budget authorizations. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing transfer of funds in the amount of Six Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$650,000/Enterprise) for the 2005 CIP 711705 WWTF Facility Plan Project.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Petition for discontinuance of Lumber Lane and Allard Drive submitted by the Highway Department on behalf of the State of NHDOT in conjunction with the State's Exit 5 Improvements project.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted refer this item to a road hearing to be scheduled by the City Clerk.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Petition for alteration from class VI to a class IV portion of Hillcrest Avenue submitted by Atty. Andrew Sullivan on behalf of Tony Roxo.

Mr. Thomas stated we are recommending that the Committee and the Board approve this change in class. However, it should be subject to receiving an acceptable improvement plan and bond for the improvements. If you read the correspondence they say that they will be making the improvements to bring that street up to a standard public street. We have not received the improvement plan and we do not have a bond on file so we support the recommendation but we request that it be subject to receiving an acceptable improvement plan and bond for the improvements.

Alderman Lopez asked why wouldn't we table it until you get your information.

Mr. Thomas answered I don't see a problem with the changing of the class as long as we have that subject on it because it won't go through until we have the plan and we have the bond on file. I don't know...there may be some issues with closings or something if the status of the street doesn't change. I believe the City is protected with those conditions placed on the action.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it wouldn't be unusual to do something like that and put it subject to that.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to approve the petition subject to receiving an acceptable plan and bond for improvements.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Osborne asking the Board to request the Committee on CIP to look at the possibility of earmarking \$300,000 each year over and above the \$550,000 for resurfacing streets and an additional \$200,000 annually for sidewalks where needed.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to refer this item to budget discussions for FY06.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning and Community Development updating the Committee relative to the process for planning studies.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this is really an information item to keep the Committee up-to-date. It was over 10 years ago now that the City adopted some major plans that actually helped turn around the City when it was in the dark days of the early 1990's. One was a downtown plan. One was a City Master Plan. We are in the initial phases of doing that. We are starting a new downtown plan and a new citywide plan and an economic development strategy. I did want to let you know that we are trying to make sure that these different studies are coordinated. Parks and Recreation is also doing a parks master plan. The Finance Department is leading a downtown parking study. It is our hope that we can have, for example, a sounding board to get public input that looks at all of those plans to make sure that they are knitted together. I was also requesting that perhaps a member of the Aldermanic Board or this Committee join in that sounding board, which would have Planning Board members, Chamber of Commerce members and other people on that to listen to all of these plans as they are developed.

Alderman Shea stated by way of thinking there are certain Board members here who have an expertise in real estate. I believe Alderman Roy so if you need an Aldermanic representative that probably would be someone that I would tend to think about.

Chairman O'Neil stated I do know that we also have two members of the Board that sit on the Planning Board as well.

Alderman Lopez stated we have MDC also.

Chairman O'Neil stated maybe the Chairman could take that under advisement and give it a little thought. I am not saying that Alderman Roy wouldn't be the right choice but you do...

Mr. MacKenzie interjected we don't need an answer tonight but probably in the next three weeks.

Alderman Lopez stated Bob I have been approached by three developers. How does the City include the developers into a process like this to make sure that their input is taken into consideration in the planning stage? I am not talking about MDC or Planning staff but outside developers.

Mr. MacKenzie responded we do talk to developers on a regular basis to find out their concerns and what they are interested in. We have not yet identified a developer for the sounding board. I think sometimes the general public gets a little suspicious when there are developers on these boards. I personally don't have an issue if you would like to see a developer or more than one developer on

this sounding board to give that perspective because they do the work; they do the hard work of developing.

Alderman Lopez replied that is what...I would maybe have you take a look at it and see outside of MDC and outside of staff developers that are not involved in these sort of institutions who can maybe listen to everybody and have an input in what can be done and all of that. That is my recommendation.

Chairman O'Neil asked the point of having the sounding board is to make sure there is not also duplication where one study comes in...for instance Ron is going to be doing a parks master plan and they may say Park A should be used for passive recreation and then another study being done by another group because then it says well it really should be used for softball. That is what you would like to make sure there is coordination here.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes definitely. If the parking study comes in and says the City needs a new parking garage in this part of the downtown then the downtown study should be working hand in glove with that.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you need any action or is this just a receive and file.

Mr. MacKenzie answered this is a receive and file but I would hope that maybe the Chairman of the Board could give consideration to nominating one or two Aldermen.

Alderman Shea asked one or two.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes as long as it doesn't form a committee unto itself, which I think would be three. Two members I think would be fine.

Alderman Shea asked does this have a lot to do with the master plan you are trying to develop or is this something that is akin to it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered this I think would help in the master plan as well. The master plan is really led by the Planning Board but it is also good to have this broad community sounding board to give feedback to the Planning Board as well. I see this as a group that really gives feedback to all five of those major studies that I was talking about.

Alderman Shea asked how long a duration do you anticipate it being or when do you anticipate it starting and finishing and how voluminous is it going to be.

Mr. MacKenzie responded two of the studies – the downtown study and the economic strategy are really fairly quick projects. They are geared towards completion in June of next year. The Parks master plan we are not quite sure when that is scheduled. The community master plan will probably be at least an 18-month period. So it is useful to have that comprehensive plan and have all of these other studies done before the master plan is completed so that they can fit as jigsaw pieces into it.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to receive and file.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning and Community Development submitting a development approach relative to the Racó Theodore pool.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if you could just turn to that page it might be helpful to walk through that. There is an approach, Item 12, that has several items. The first is already done. It was referred to this Committee. Item 2 we would like to put \$50,000 into the contract relatively soon in the next couple of months and we would bring that to your Committee. There is a \$51,000 balance I believe from the Cohas Fire Station, which we would recommend be assigned to the Racó Theodore Park. Item 3, Parks & Recreation would forge ahead with completing the final design and actually getting bids on the project. Then on Item 4 there will be two contracts on this project. One for the pool itself and one for the bathhouse and it is primarily because we are looking to fund the bathhouse with HUD monies and there are different strings attached to it. Once they get the bids in and if they have good contracts and bids, early next year the Board could approve those contracts even though maybe technically all of the money is not in place. Item 5, the Mayor has committed that in his next CIP to be presented next March let's say that he would put in additional CDBG funding to help the project go ahead. Then Items 6 and 7, as part of the FY06 process the Board could expedite this project, expedite the funding and try to get the funding in place so that we could have a relatively early opening of the pool. It is still a little hard to tell whether we would have both the pool and the bathhouse done at the same time but I think that would be the goal. I think Mr. Ludwig has said that the contractor or the contractors have generally said they could shoot for July 4. That is a very aggressive schedule but this schedule that we lay out here, this approach, is at least trying to achieve that very aggressive schedule.

Alderman Lopez asked on Item 6 it says if eligible for the CDBG cash. Don't we know if it is eligible?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we have determined...Sam has been working to look at the area and whether it qualifies under HUD regulations and he has determined that it is CDBG eligible. That has been since we wrote this approach.

Alderman Lopez asked so we can scratch that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Smith stated as everybody well knows this project has been on the line since 1997 and I did go to Manchester Water Works and they estimated in the last 10 years the estimated cost of water loss was \$22,816, which comes out to \$2,300 a year. This pool has been leaking since 1996. If anybody has been over in the area, the bathhouse is a disgrace to the City of Manchester and I wish to move this project forward. I did have a meeting with Sam Maranto and Ron Ludwig and we came up with this alternative. As you all know last year this was supposed to be the first thing bonded and because we were over bonded they asked me to substitute something. We did substitute the playground. I think this is a must. I think we have to go along with this. Has anybody seen the area? There are no ifs, ands or buts. We have to do the pool.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the development approach relative to the Raco Theodore pool.

Chairman O'Neil asked and Ron you are going to push the contractors to get as close to July 4 as possible.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes.

TABLED ITEMS

13. Derryfield Park Rehabilitation Phase II.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Mr. Ludwig stated yes we are preparing final construction documents for the Derryfield Rehabilitation Phase II Project. We are about two weeks in the making right now or less. TF Moran has made some adjustments to some of the concerns, which I believe is the reason this got tabled in the first place relative to some tennis courts at the time and some traffic study issues out on Bridge Street and the entrance to the park at Derryfield, which we looked at. One other issue that comes to mind is an interior road that has been reduced to more of a walking pathway

that connects the existing playground to the park facility to the rear. We are confident that the project is ready to move forward and we would like to bid it this fall or even winter.

Chairman O'Neil asked and funding you think we are all set on.

Mr. Ludwig answered I think we are.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to allow Parks & Recreation to move forward with the Derryfield Park Rehabilitation Phase II.

Chairman O'Neil asked has something started up there already. I could have sworn I saw a dumptruck and a backhoe on the baseball field. Is that a different project?

Mr. Ludwig answered yes we are just doing that infield over. We are doing three infields over in the City.

14. Discussion of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Master Plan.

This item remained on the table.

15. Synthetic turf maintenance at Gill Stadium, West Memorial Field, and the Clem Lemire Sports Complex at Memorial High School and a list of additional capital items needed to properly operate Gill Stadium.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have not, to the best of my knowledge, received any information from Finance on how we are going to pay for this.

Alderman Lopez stated Mr. MacKenzie, I think a couple of meetings ago we were talking about something different but we brought up the issue of Parks needing these items for Gill Stadium. Has anybody looked into some of the...I know you are looking for more money for the master plan, which is important but at the same time this equipment is important. Are there any projects that you have been able to identify for additional funds? I know one of the projects that came in high and I talked to Sam about it was some money for art work at Kalivas Park. We could take a good look at that because they came in with a very high number and I know you had to expend some funds and maybe we could readdress that and try to divert some of this money over there. I don't know.

Mr. MacKenzie responded we did meet at the Finance Department to look at some options. I think the Finance Department was hoping that Parks & Recreation could do it out of their Enterprise program. I don't know if Parks & Recreation has agreed with that yet. It is perhaps a little bit more difficult in that much of this equipment is probably not CD eligible. The Kalivas Park project was a CD project. You are correct that the bids came in too high so I don't know if they are going to proceed with those but I think that \$30,000 was CD money so those funds could not be used.

Alderman Lopez asked if we can have CDBG money in different parts of the City and where this stadium is in the area of Beech Street I just can't comprehend how it could not be CDBG money.

Mr. Maranto responded there are a couple of reasons. Gill Stadium really primarily services the entire City and also people from outside the area. Even though it is an area where the residents are low to moderate income, the primary benefit does not include that neighborhood. CDBG monies also are not to be used to purchase equipment and a lot of these things are really maintenance as well. CDBG money should not be used for maintenance either so there are several reasons why CDBG money cannot be used. If the stadium was just generally for that neighborhood only, which is not the case, then we could look at doing improvements in there.

Alderman Lopez stated I realize that 100% of the people in that area don't utilize Gill Stadium but in looking at it there could be a percentage of CDBG money used because people in that area do use Gill Stadium in various capacities.

Mr. Maranto responded unfortunately with CDBG money it is either 100% or nothing. The only thing we can do there again is anything that has to do with ADA compliance we could use ADA money for.

Alderman Lopez asked, Ron, what capacity do you have in the Enterprise Fund because of Derryfield and everything else. Are you going to be able to buy this equipment through the Enterprise? If you can't, we have to do something. We can't just assume that you are going to do it.

Mr. Ludwig answered I think my letter of October 5 pretty much spells out my feelings in terms of what the Enterprise should and shouldn't be doing. It is not a Water Works type or an EPD type of Enterprise. We are an Enterprise based strictly on user fees, which I believe this Board has directed us to keep as affordable as possible. So it is kind of a Catch-22. While we want to be able to pay for the items we are supposed to pay for with golf, skiing and skating fees,

there are absolutely no fees generated by Gill Stadium. Now we can pass off some of the costs to the School District and we have done that but as you all well know this year with the good grace of this Board we kind of developed a different procedure in which we allowed the School District to use Gill Stadium. They basically are a renter and not an 85% owner, which is the way we charged off expenses to the facility last year and the Aldermen basically picked up about half of the expenses at Gill Stadium this year in the general fund budget so when we look at say charging off a larger piece of equipment or a lighting contract, which is something that we should talk about tonight. Those are issues that I have to be very careful when I go back to the School District and explain to them exactly how we charge off particular items on the expense side for them. So it is not that simple in terms of what Finance has directed us to do, which is just build it into the School Department budget next year. It doesn't work quite that easily.

Alderman Garrity stated I realize that the School District is a renter. Is there any...now you need a total of \$73,658 for the equipment is that right?

Mr. Thomas responded actually Alderman Garrity it has probably come down a little. We have mixed and matched over the fall here to try and convert the field with borrowing equipment and renting equipment and doing some different things. In our opinion there are a couple of pieces of equipment down the road and I would assume we are going to try maintain Gill in the condition that it is right now that are absolutely necessary to have the ballpark and there are balloon tired vehicles specifically to be run around on a field like Gill is now, the synthetic surface. One item I bring to your attention, which is extremely important tonight...we know that the lighting system at Gill, which was in pretty good shape was upgraded to meet the requirements of the minor league ball team this year. Shades and some new ballasts, completely relamped to get the lamps up to the maximum lumens in the infield to meet their requirements would now become eligible or are eligible as we speak for a lighting contract. We have lighting contracts at the new Memorial field. We have a lighting contract with Musco, the contractor at Livingston field. This is a 10-year agreement that covers just about everything from lamps to ballast replacements to wiring over a 10-year period. In the past we have done our own work on the Musco lights at Gill with the assistance of the Fire Department coming in with their ladder trucks if they are in service. They have been able to help us over the years. We can't drive that kind of apparatus on the synthetic surface given the sophisticated drainage system, which lies right under the carpet. The best way to go for the City, quite frankly, is with a maintenance agreement. We have already, because we just couldn't wait any longer we had until the end of December or mid-December to exercise our options with Musco. We basically paid it out of the Enterprise already. Many of these items we have paid out of the Enterprise. We could not wait any longer in most of these cases. We had to make purchases of fence to keep people from

going on the field and other purchases that were related – modification of goal posts and things like that. We have expended considerable dollars up to this point just to make Gill ready and we just couldn't wait for answers any longer.

Alderman Garrity stated I want to get back to my point. This Board has spent millions upon millions of dollars on these fields. We had School Board members lined up saying please fund this. Have they had any willingness at all to help fund the equipment needed to maintain it?

Mr. Ludwig asked at Gill.

Alderman Garrity answered at Clem Lemire or West Memorial...basically you are going to use this equipment at all three fields are you not.

Mr. Ludwig responded one of the pieces that we got, Alderman Garrity, for Memorial, which was a part of our negotiations with the synthetic company, FieldTurf from Maine or ultimately Canada that came in and supplied the product was that we asked them for a better piece of equipment than was supplied with the project and we did get that. That piece of equipment is called a super groomer, is pretty much used universally between the three fields. We have used it at West. We have used it at Gill and it was actually demonstrated for us at Memorial. It, in itself, is usable universally between the three fields.

Alderman Garrity stated but I am talking about the equipment you have quoted down here for \$73,658. Are you basically going to use that equipment at all three fields or just at Gill?

Mr. Ludwig responded the balloon tire tractor backhoe was basically to use at Gill for excavation of your sliding boxes, your pitcher's mound and any work that you needed to do around the warning track. So it is pretty much a vehicle that would be used specifically at Gill. It also has a big broom. Once you...for instance after Thanksgiving if snow doesn't stop us from doing this we will be sucking the rubber out of those patches of grass that you see and taking the carpet up and excavating out that material and getting it ready for baseball next spring. When we put that back in we have to brush that rubber back in with that big broom. Now we rented one this fall to do that and it worked fine but over a period of years I think this is a universal piece of equipment with many attachments that you are going to get a lot of years of use out of at Gill particularly if you want to maintain it.

Chairman O'Neil stated two of the items here I think are immediate. That is the Musco contract for lighting and the Gator Utility Vehicle because that is going to be used there in the fall, spring and summer correct?

Mr. Ludwig responded yes it is.

Chairman O'Neil stated the others we may have a little time, I mean the field is striped for now. It will have to be restriped in the springtime.

Mr. Ludwig replied I looked at it today or actually I watched it on television and talked to the supervisor today. It is getting a little light right now. I asked him about going forward with the next two Saturdays, which are play-off games and then skip a week and then it is Thanksgiving. In our opinion it is getting a little light. We are going to touch it up a little bit but again we don't want to go real aggressive with the paint because those are lines that we don't want to see in the baseball season so we are going to have to touch it up a little bit for the play-off games or we could be criticized in that regard but we don't want to overdo that painting either.

Chairman O'Neil asked am I correct that you were able to use a...for the balloon tire tractor in place of that you were able to use a piece equipment from the golf course.

Mr. Ludwig answered we did have a small cub cadet that we used on the field to excavate out some of that material.

Chairman O'Neil asked did it help.

Mr. Ludwig answered it helped.

Chairman O'Neil stated my point is that we may be able to put that purchase off until the springtime and if you need it...when you rented the broom you only rented it for a day or two I am guessing.

Mr. Ludwig responded we rented it for about three days.

Chairman O'Neil stated so I am saying that some of these things maybe can be put off until we get a little more time. I think the two most important are the lighting contract and the utility vehicle, which is approximately \$33,000. I think that might be a better approach for us. It would give us a little time to work on some of these other things. Maybe it does make sense every year to rent the broom for three days as opposed to buying one if that is the only place it is going to be used. Somehow we can maybe come up with material to construct a storage structure and the billygoat blower, but at least we get the two most important items taken care of. That would be my recommendation.

Alderman Smith stated as you know I have been an advocate of moving Gill Stadium out of the Enterprise but it seems like nobody else wants to move along with it and since it is in the Enterprise system it has been a detriment to the Parks Director. I just say you know if we are not going to do anything the user fees are going to be increased. That means Babe Ruth, Legion, School Department and so forth but I would like to ask Ron, it just bothers me a little bit, the School Department and especially Manchester West they have exclusive use of that field. Am I correct?

Mr. Ludwig asked of Gill.

Alderman Smith answered no West Memorial.

Mr. Ludwig stated yes.

Alderman Smith stated and no one else uses it like the Pop Warner team moved down to the Piscataquog right am I correct.

Mr. Ludwig responded yes.

Alderman Smith stated these youth teams have to have someplace to play and the only municipal field I can see them playing at is Gill Stadium because the schools are going to take care of West Memorial and Memorial and I have no problem with it but our problem was we want a multi-purpose field and we have one at Gill Stadium but we don't want to fund maintaining it. I can't see spending \$4 or \$5 million when we are not going to maintain it. I think that someone in City government should be able to come up with some kind of money. It is just like putting the cart before the horse. I mean this is the most important thing is maintaining the facility and that is what happens to most of our facilities. We do not maintain them.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is why I suggested, I think the two most important items immediately for maintaining is the contract and the utility vehicle. The striping machine, other than touching up this fall is not going to be needed probably until the springtime correct Ron?

Mr. Ludwig responded we won't need one for the rest of the year.

Chairman O'Neil stated so you won't need it until next fall. So maybe we can address that in the next budget. I particularly think that if he has a vehicle or piece of equipment at the golf course that can help out and save us some money and maybe rent the broom for three days maybe that is the right approach on that one. The material to construct the storage shed, again as we get into the springtime we

might find some money for that and the same thing with the blower. I think if we can identify about \$33,000 that takes care of the two major maintenance items.

Alderman Shea stated identifying them and then finding a source of money are two different things. I am wondering could we make a motion to give him the money through contingency tonight?

Chairman O'Neil stated all I am saying, Alderman Shea, is \$33,000 is easier to deal with tonight than \$73,000.

Alderman Shea responded I am wondering has Mr. MacKenzie identified any additional money that can be used in order to pay the \$33,000 that Parks & Recreation needs.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think the only money that we had identified was probably \$5,000 that originally we were looking at for graffiti but the Highway Department now has a system and a person doing that. So the \$5,000 is I think all that is left in Cash CIP balances. The only recommendation I would have is to perhaps use that money for it and perhaps the balance from City contingency.

Alderman Shea asked Ron do you need the money now or do you need it say in the future in order to cover that expense. In other words if we were to say at the next meeting or at the following meeting as it were in February or March does that make any difference to you? As long as we sort of say you know you can guarantee that somehow we will give you the \$27,000...in other words he says \$5,000. Would that be acceptable?

Mr. Ludwig answered again in discussions that I had with my staff today, particularly Ed Wojnilowczic. We had this discussion this morning. Knowing these items were tabled I wasn't really sure they were going to come up. We haven't been assured all fall that any of these items were going to come forward that were going to allow us to accomplish the change over necessary for football. I think everybody in this room knew that we were going to do it and we did it. What I am saying is that we are spending this money out of Enterprise money and when the Enterprise isn't in the financial condition that it should be I want everyone in this room to understand why because we are spending money and not increasing our user fees to offset the expenses. That is what my letter said on October 5. I stand on that. That is fine. We were given directives two years ago not to increase golf dues due to the country club. We maintained that and we haven't done that. If we have to make improvements to the golf course, we will make adjustments to the golf fees but we haven't increased the fees to the golf course because of the country club. Consequently I don't think it is really fair to increase fees at the country club, the ski area or the skating rinks to support

purchases of these kind at Gill Stadium where there is no revenue being generated to offset those expenses. It is just a matter of where do we get the money. Alderman Smith is right. Alderman O'Neil has said it before that maybe Gill really doesn't belong in the Enterprise at all and I am coming to believe that myself. Remember the Parks Department was awarded the Enterprise. Since we have been awarded the Enterprise when Clem left we have been trying to work within the confines of what this Board has wanted us to do and in some cases it has worked out fairly well by the way and in other cases we have had to make adjustments. It has just been a work in progress and a learning process. We purchased the lighting contract today out of our money. I think Sam may be able to verify that. Is that right?

Mr. Maranto answered yes.

Mr. Ludwig stated so I am not sitting in front of you trying to snooker this Committee into giving us money. We had to make decisions. We had nothing to go on with this. We are making the decisions but I am telling you and I want to be on record that these purchases over time will hurt the Enterprise if not put it under.

Alderman Lopez stated we all maybe have to have a discussion about the Enterprise system at Gill stadium because it will all fall to the City and we have to know what those numbers are. I want to ask the question...we just took care of Derryfield. We have all of the money there. We have the bonding and we have the cash that we received right?

Mr. Ludwig responded yes we do.

Alderman Lopez asked what is wrong, Mr. MacKenzie, we all know that projects usually have some balances left as we move along so why couldn't we just use some of that money to purchase this and then whatever bonding we have left we could transfer to Derryfield and make up what we take out of there.

Chairman O'Neil asked just for clarification, which Derryfield project are you talking about.

Alderman Lopez answered I am talking about the baseball field. We have about \$900,000 is that correct?

Mr. Ludwig stated no you don't have exactly \$900,000. There was \$400,000 in bondable money and we had secured from the ball team for lack of a better term, another \$424,000. Now we have design money in there and the actual construction dollars probably look more like \$650,000 or so.

Alderman Lopez asked we have bonded money and cash that we received for that field is that correct.

Mr. Ludwig answered I think it is pretty much all bonded money.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the payment from the baseball team of \$424,000 I think can be classified as cash. I would be hesitant about buying any field equipment at Gill out of bond money but there is no restriction on cash in terms of using it.

Alderman Lopez stated my point is, not to shortchange that particular project but understanding that if we took \$40,000 out of that project to give to him so that he can fulfill this obligation understanding that we have these other projects to go forward that we always know that we have money left over in most of the projects to transfer \$40,000 back to Parks. Is that something you people can look at and work out with the Finance people to see if that could be done?

Mr. MacKenzie responded I don't see any issue with that. It is a policy issue. I think that is what it comes down to. The Board would have to take the action to physically take that money from one project and give it to another so you would have to deal with those policy issues. I don't see an issue with that if the Board fully agreed with that. It may shortchange Derryfield but if you are committing to reprogramming that money in the next CIP process do you see an issue with that Ron?

Mr. Ludwig replied no.

Chairman O'Neil stated the only thing is your budget is very tight for Derryfield and as we know pricing on projects hasn't been favorable to the City in any department.

Mr. Ludwig responded no in fact we are bidding a tennis court as an alternate.

Chairman O'Neil replied I was going to say that. You told me that last week that you had to do it because there may not be enough money for the project. So taking \$40,000 may be okay or may not be okay but he is not going to know until he gets the bids in on it.

Alderman Lopez asked when is that going to happen.

Mr. Ludwig answered actually I have asked the consultant to make a presentation next Tuesday to our Commission and immediately after that we will be bidding the project.

Alderman Lopez stated we don't have to take any action on it.

Mr. Ludwig replied we are covered for the lights right now and I think...I don't have to go into any more detail. Everyone in this room understands how we feel about it and I think we are all trying to work it out.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we all seem to be in some agreement that somehow we have to figure out how to get Gill Stadium out of the Enterprise because it is not helping the situation.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do think the City should be committing more money to the Gill Stadium equipment. I think Ron is making a point here that you just can't keep expecting him to take it out of the Enterprise but I think if the Board put in a CIP Cash program in next year's CIP budget he could kind of backtrack on some of these expenses and get a lot of that other equipment purchased.

Alderman Lopez stated I think also we lost a good man for the simple reason that we build all of these things and don't have proper equipment to take care of them. Maybe, Mr. Chairman and Alderman Smith you are right. Maybe we should have a full breakdown of Gill Stadium cost wise and what that means to the general fund. I would like to see that because we have to put this thing to bed one way or the other. If it is going to stay in the Enterprise then we have to find ways to help Parks & Recreation. If it is not then we are going to give it to the City but how much is that going to cost the City. I think we need to have the right parties here – the Finance Officer and other people. I strongly recommend that we have a meeting.

Alderman Lopez moved to have a meeting to discuss taking Gill Stadium out of the Enterprise system. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated this is the time to do it because hopefully in the immediate future we are talking about maintenance. We shouldn't have to come up with any bond money to do repairs or anything. We should be good at Gill Stadium, the infrastructure at Gill Stadium, for some time now. So we are really talking about maintenance. I don't know how many staff are assigned there full time.

Mr. Ludwig responded last year we were actually there operating the ballpark. It ranges between one and one and a half.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is not big money to the City so we are looking for a staff person and some equipment. I don't think it is going to be big dollars to get it out of the Enterprise myself.

Alderman Smith stated Ron maybe you could help us out if you would get a list of like maybe the last five years and see what the user fees paid in to Gill Stadium. I think that will enlighten most of the Aldermen as to why it shouldn't be in the Enterprise.

Mr. Ludwig responded I can pretty much tell you that it won't exceed probably \$5,000 in five years.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is really what Gill Stadium was built for – to be used by the community.

Mr. Ludwig stated I think the Aldermen took a gigantic step, Alderman Smith, this year just by funding half of it in the general fund because it has allowed us to accommodate most of the teams who wanted to use it that couldn't afford to use it. I think that is what everyone in this room wants. The Bears and different teams have been able to use it. Next year I understand that the high schools are bringing in girls field hockey.

Alderman Lopez asked can we identify that the Finance Officer, Parks and Planning should be involved in this so that we get the correct numbers.

Alderman Shea stated also you have a person working at Parks & Recreation that does financing too. I think that person should be included as well.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to put Item 15 back on the table.

Mr. Ludwig stated just to clarify on Item 14 because we did have some discussion about this and maybe I wasn't clear but I was under the impression, were we going to move forward with RFP's after we get a little committee together.

Chairman O'Neil responded yes to try to see what they came back with for numbers.

Mr. Ludwig stated I brought 13 proposals with me tonight.

Chairman O'Neil replied you are absolutely correct on that. Am I right, Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will see where the pricing comes out and what we are getting for that pricing.

Mr. Ludwig replied right but I thought we were going to have a small committee and I am not sure of who at this point.

Mr. MacKenzie stated School, Parks and Planning.

Mr. Ludwig asked are they going to short list the RFQ's that we have in place and then see how the numbers come in before we come back.

Alderman O'Neil answered you are absolutely correct.

Mr. Ludwig asked is that how you would like us to proceed.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we get a motion on that. That is what staff discussed. Parks, Planning and School were going to get together and look at the 13 RFQ's that came in and shortlist them to maybe five or six and send it out and have them come back with this is what we think you need to do and this is what we think the price is and then we can make a determination. Maybe we are getting a good price for what we need and maybe not. It will give us some idea of where we need to be. Can we get a motion on that?

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to have staff look at the RFQ's for the Parks Master Plan, make a shortlist and get an idea of what the price would be.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk asked some indulgence. We had asked for an archive writer at the initiation of the budget last year and it was to be utilized for Building, Solicitor, Tax and our office. Basically it is a dual media machine that would allow us to do microfilming and a CD-ROM for searches on archives. What is happening is obviously you are expanding the amount of paperwork that is being stored in archives and you are going to run out of room again pretty soon. The equipment costs approximately \$18,000. We have been working with Information Systems and we are basically just asking if there is a way that the Committee can request Planning and others to look and see if there is a way to come up with some funding for that machine because ultimately it will save the City some money and space storage problems as well.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to have the Planning staff look into funding \$18,000 for an archive writer for the City Clerk's Office.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee